REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action dated May 11, 2007, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-28. Claims 19, 21, and 24 have been amended. No new matter has been added in these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of all Claims 1-28 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 19-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to a non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the examiner stated that they comprise mere software per se and that they include non-statutory transmission embodiments.

Independent Claims 19 and 24 have been amended to more clearly indicate that the use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material claimed. As amended, Claim 19 includes, "in a computer readable storage, an electronic page configured to display a plurality of electronic web pages to a user on a computer desktop." Amended Claim 24 includes "in a computer readable storage, an Internet browser program for displaying electronic pages on a computer display."

In light of the amendments, Claims 19-28 are believed to be directed towards statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Discussion of Claim Rejections To Bocionek Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11, 13, and 17-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Bocionek et al. Applicant notes that Bocionek was filed on May 4, 2001, and claims priority to a provisional application filed on January 16, 2001. Enclosed herewith is a Declaration of the named inventor (Steve Walrath) under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131, evidencing conception and reduction to practice of the presently claimed invention prior to the earliest priority date of the Bocionek reference, January 16, 2001. Thus, Bocionek no longer qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Discussion of Claim Rejections To Gauthier Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 10, 19, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Gauthier et al. Applicant respectfully submits that Gauthier fails to teach each of the limitations of these claims.

The Office Action stated that "Gauthier teaches a method and system (abstract) of using a spreadsheet to place electronic pages into tab formats (col. 1, line 1 – col. 9, line 25), wherein a client requests page information from a server (col. 9, line 25 – col. 10, line 53) and said data is received and hidden until a tab object causes it to be displayed (col. 10, line 53 – col. 13, line 35)." However, Gauthier does not describe such a system.

Gauthier instead describes a system of extracting tabular data from a Web page and importing that tabular data into a spreadsheet. *Col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 2*. For example, Figure 10 shows a Web page containing tabular data **1025**. A subset **1030** of the tabular data **1025** has been selected to be imported into a spreadsheet. *Col. 23, lines 5 – 20*. Figure 11 shows the spreadsheet with the imported data subset **1030**. While Gauthier describes a number of variations of this operation, the variations may be sorted into two categories: providing an option within a Web browser to export data to a spreadsheet application (e.g. Figures 10, 17, and 20); or providing an option within a spreadsheet application to open a browser window in order to import data (e.g. Figures 3, 4, 13, and 21). Gauthier also describes controls within a spreadsheet application for updating the imported tabular data as the corresponding data changes on the source Web page. *Col. 23, line 59 – col. 24, line 29*. For example, tabular stock market data may be imported into a spreadsheet, and the address of the Web page from which it originated may be stored with the spreadsheet. Using the stored address, the spreadsheet may be updated with new stock market data at a later time without having to navigate back to the Web page. Rather than open and display the Web page again, the user may press a refresh button (e.g., refresh button **512** in Figure 13) and the spreadsheet application will download and display the current tabular data from the Web page. *Col. 24, lines 26-29*. Thus, Gauthier teaches acquiring data from an electronic page, placing that data into a table in a spreadsheet, and generating intuitive Web Queries.

This system described by Gauthier is not similar to and does not anticipate the claimed invention. For example, Claim 1 includes "a first browser component configured to display a

first electronic page and a second browser component configured to display a second electronic page." Claims 10, 19, and 24 include similar language. Nowhere does Gauthier describe more than a single browser component. As described above, the spreadsheet application described by Gauthier does not load one or more electronic pages. Gauthier merely describes importing data. To the extent that Gauthier describes a browser component, it describes either a single Internet browser that runs independently and has an add-on software module that enables exporting data or an add-on software module in a spreadsheet application for allowing a user to open a single Internet browser as a new window. Additionally, because Gauthier fails to even describe "a first browser component … and a second browser component," Gauthier cannot describe controls for managing these multiple browser components.

Gauthier fails to describe every element recited in Claims 1, 10, 19, and 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bocionek in view of Alcazar et al. The Examiner also rejected Claims 5-7 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bocionek in view of Austin. Dependent Claims 3 and 5-7 depend from independent Claim 1, and dependent Claims 12 and 14-16 depend from independent Claim 10. As described above, Bocionek is not prior art to the present application in view of the attached Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131. Accordingly, the combination of Bocionek and Alcazar or Bocionek and Austin would not make the claimed invention obvious. Thus, Claims 3, 5-7, 12, and 14-16 are believed to be allowable as depending from allowable base claims, and as having other independently patentable features.

Conclusion

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner wish to discuss these or any other issues regarding the aforementioned, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _August 10, 2007_   By: _____

Michael L. Fuller
Registration No. 36,516
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

3792014
052107